

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars:

In the drawings

Revised Figs. 1-4 are shown in the "Replacement Sheets" of drawing appended herewith. Figs. 1-4 have been amended to add reference numerals identifying the tables, table entries (or rows), and the data items contained in the table entries. No new matter is added.

In the specification

The specification has been amended to provide literal antecedent basis for amendments to the claims, and to refer to the reference numerals added to Figs. 1-4 identifying the tables, table entries (or rows), and the data items contained in the table entries. No new matter is added.

Rejection of claims 1 and 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1 and 4-7 presently stand rejected as being unpatentable over Win et al. (U.S. 6,453,353) in view of Garretson (U.S. 2001/0047306). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended to more completely define the present invention, by incorporating limitations previously recited in claim 4, describing the table structure of the authorization database. Claim 4 has been cancelled, accordingly. Thus, claim 1, as amended, more clearly defines the table structure of the authorization database.

It is respectfully submitted that Win and Garretson fail to disclose or suggest the authorization database table structure as recited in the amended claim 1. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge

generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must *teach or suggest all the claim limitations*. (MPEP 2143) (emphasis added). *All claim limitations* must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974) (emphasis added). “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).

According to claim 1, the authorization database includes an identification comparison table. Table entries (rows) each have an identification number, a verification number, and a user name. It is respectfully submitted that neither Win nor Garretson disclose such an identification comparison table.

The examiner suggests that Win teaches an identification and authorization comparison table, as well as a verification number. It is respectfully submitted that Win lacks any teaching or suggestion of the specific table structure set forth in claim 1. Moreover, while the examine refers to Win at col. 6, line 62 for a teaching of the verification number, what is found in this passage is a reference to decrypting information contained in a cookie, not to any table structure that includes identification number, a verification number, and a user name. The examiner further refers to col. 22, line 49, and col. 6, line 3. However, these passages only inform that “passwords are stored in the Registry Server 108 in an encrypted format” (col. 22, line 49) and that a user may log in by “entering a name and password” (col. 6, line 3). While it may be inferred (although it is not explicitly disclosed) that the name and password may be stored together, such an inference falls far short of the required teaching or suggestion of an identification comparison table having entries (rows) that each have an identification number, a verification number, and a user name.

The examiner also suggests that Win teaches a group and authorization comparison table consisting of group names and IDs. However, Win does not teach or suggest a group authorization table configured to store a plurality of entries each having a group name, and

an individual authorization name and user name associated with the group name. Further, Win does not teach or suggest an individual authorization comparison table configured to store a plurality of entries each having an individual authorization name and a web page name and web page name connection site associated with the individual authorization name.

While the examiner refers to Win at col. 5, lines 33-38 for a teaching of a “group and authorization table consisting of group names and IDs,” this passage merely states that “a functional group is often a department in which similar functions exist. Examples of functional groups are Marketing, Sales, Engineering, Human Resources, and Operations.” This definition of what a functional group is cannot be construed as any teaching or suggestion of the specific database structure described in claim 1. There is no suggestion whatsoever of such a table, let alone the particular structure of the row entries of the table.

Claim 1 sets forth an authorization database comprising four separate tables. Win provides no teaching or suggestion of the claimed structure of any of these tables. Garretson is entirely silent regarding user authorization, and has no teaching or suggestion whatsoever with respect to the authorization database recited in claim 1.

The structure of the authorization database recited in claim 1 may be better appreciated with reference to the limitations set forth in claim 5, which recite steps of using the authorization database tables to identify and display web page names and web page connection sites that a client may access, based on the client’s identification number and verification number, and on the contents and configuration of the authorization database tables. The combined teachings of Win and Garretson fail entirely to teach or suggest the particular method set forth by claim 5 to identify and display web page names and web page connection sites that a client may access, based on the client’s identification number and verification number.

It is respectfully submitted that, for at least these reasons, Win in combination with Garretson fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness of the present invention as set forth in claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, and the dependent

claims 5-7, are allowable over the cited references, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Every effort has been made to place the application fully in condition for allowance, and to remove all issues raised by the Examiner in the Official Action.

In view of the amendments to the claims, and in further view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that claims 1 and 5-7 be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500

Date: December 23, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John R. Schaefer", written in a cursive style.

JOHN R. SCHAEFER
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 47,921